Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Fig(s) 1 and 3. The sheets, which include Figs 1 and 3 replace the original sheets including Fig(s) 1 and 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14, 15, 17-23 and 25-32 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14, 15, 17-23 and 25-32 and rejected.

Summary of Telephonic Interview

On December 19, 2007, the undersigned conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner. The substances of the topics discussed during the interview are reflected in the claim amendments and are further discussed herein below.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to because descriptive textual labels were requested for reference characters "14a" and "14b."

Corrected drawings are attached.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The examiner opined that:

> More specifically, the claimed subject matter provides for identifying nodes within the hierarchical data, however there is no link between this concept and the other elements recited within the body of the claim to enable loading (or copying) of the **hierarchical data** into a first relational table. For example, claim 1 recites "storing the *data* from the node in a *record* in a first buffer ... *copying* the record from the first buffer to a relational table"; *however* the claim does not make clear that "the data" is "hierarchical data". Also, the claim omits specific limitation within the body of the claim "loading" operation.

Action p. 5. Applicants submit that this is an improper § 101 rejection. The above passage is confusing because the examiner's basis for the § 101 rejection appears to be based on either lack of enablement or a lack of clarity or both. Such rejections do not go to patentable subject matter, but find their basis in § 112. Nevertheless, whether § 101 or § 112, Applicants submit that the claims are clear, but have amended the claims to make them even more clear. The "data" is organized in a hierarchical fashion, but any specific data element,

after it is removed from the hierarchical organization, is not itself hierarchical. It is data. For example, after loading into the table, the data element is organized in a relational fashion. Applicants have amended the claim to make this distinction more clear. Applicants further do not understand the basis for the "omitted limitation" rejection that the examiner makes. Other than making the conclusory statement that loading should be in the claim, the examiner provides no basis.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the § 101 rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0169788 in view of Garth et al. U.S. Patent 5,873,091. Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons set forth below.

With respect to independent claim 1, the examiner maintains:

> storing the data from the first node in a record in a first buffer associated with the first relational table [paragraph 108];
>
> ...
>
> identifying a third node within the hierarchical data corresponding to a first column in a second relational table and fourth node associated with the third node corresponding to data to be stored in a row of the second relational table [note mapping tables 36 paragraph 0101 and 0062];

Action p. 6. Applicants submit that Lee et al. do not teach that the claimed buffer and record system claimed in claim 1, for example. The cited portion of Lee for example says the following:

> Namely, step **40** of storing the DTD **18** into the DTDM tables **90, 92** and **94** preferably comprises steps of creating and filling the DTDM-Item table **90** in the metadata tables **34** (shown by reference number **46** and described in greater detail in **FIG. 3),** creating and filling a DTDMAttribute table **92** in the metadata tables **34** (shown by reference number **48** and described in greater detail in **FIG. 4),** creating and storing a DTDM-Nesting table **94** in the metadata tables **34** (shown by reference number **50** and described in greater detail in **FIG. 5),** and initializing a pattern mapping table (shown by reference number **58** and described in greater detail in FIGS. **9-11).**

Lee et al., para. [108]. Nothing in this paragraph mentions records or buffers, which form an important distinction over the prior art. To further clarify that distinction, the applicants have amended claim 1 to recite:

> copying the record from the first buffer to the first relational table and the record from the second buffer to the second relational table as each record is determined to be complete .

Therefore, after a record is completed it can be inserted into a table from the buffer independent of the record for the other table. This provides the result of allowing for very large files to be move among databases.

Furthermore, Applicants have incorporated the limitations of claim 7 into claim1 and have canceled claim 7. Since the examiner provided no prior art rejection for claim 7, that claim should be deemed allowable.

Inasmuch as claims 2-5, 11 and 12 depend from claim 1, Applicants submit that they also patentably define over the Lee et al. in view of Garth et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 14-15, 17-23 and 25-32 are rejected under 35 § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/01697880.

Claim 14, as amended, recites:

> streaming the records into the at least two different relational tables by inserting the records from the at least two different files into corresponding ones of the at least two different relational tables as each record is determined to be complete.

As indicated above, the ability to move large amounts of data is an import result of the claimed invention. Consequently, claims 14 and 25 recite "streaming." Moreover, as noted in the previous response, Lee does not teach or suggest ***mapping*** as claimed and ***streaming*** records into at least two different tables as claimed. For at least that reason, claim 14 also patentably defines over Lee. Nevertheless, applicants have further clarified the distinction and amend the claim as noted above to recited that the streaming occurs as each record is deemed to be complete. Thus, for example, several records could be inserted into one table before even a single other record is inserted into a second table.

In as much as claims 15 and 17-23 depend from claim 14, those claims also patentably define over Lee at least for the same reason. Claim 25, as amended, has a similar limitation to claim 14. For at least that reason, claim 25 also patentably defines over Lee.

Inasmuch as claims 26-32 depend from claim 25, they also define over Lee for at least the same reason.

Date: January 4, 2008

/Michael J. Swope/
Michael J. Swope
Registration No. 38,041

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439